

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1-16 were rejected. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10 have been amended. Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-6 were objected to for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. In response, Applicant has amended the claims to address the issues raised by Examiner. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 2-3 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action.

The amendments to independent claim 1 clarify that the “audiovisual devices” are claimed in combination with a chair. With regard to amended claim 10, “the seat” has been deleted. In view of the amendments above, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under § 112 second paragraph be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 9, 11 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated

by U.S. Patent No. 6,102,476 to May et al. for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. Applicant asserts that May does not anticipate features claimed in claim 9 of the present invention because every element of the amended claims is not taught by May.

Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, “the plurality of entertainment accessories including a video player for playing a video program and a display for displaying the video program are enclosed in the plurality of compartments.”

May discloses armrests (16, 17), but does not disclose or suggest that “a plurality of entertainment accessories including a video player for playing a video program and a display for displaying the video program are enclosed in the plurality of compartments.” In particular, the armrests in May do not enclose a display for displaying a video program. For example, the monitor (44) as a display is positioned outside the armrests. The monitor is positioned on a monitor support (41) attached to the end of an arm (43). (See lines 41-43, Column 3). The armrests (16, 17), instead, serve as the case of a personal computer by housing circuit boards, a connector panel, a power supply, and a hard disk drive. (See lines 11-12, Column 3). Thus, May does not disclose or suggest “the plurality of entertainment accessories including a video player for playing a video program and a display for displaying the video program are enclosed in the plurality of compartments,” as essentially claimed in amended claim 9.

Accordingly, for at least the above reason, May does not anticipate claim 9. Claims 10-16 depend from claim 9. These dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinguished and patentable over May for at least the same reason given above for respective base claim 9. Therefore, withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over May et al.

Claim 1 is directed to a chair for housing a plurality of audiovisual devices. The plurality of audiovisual devices are enclosed in compartments of the armrests or the backrest.

It is respectfully submitted that at the very minimum, May does not render obvious claim 1 because May does not disclose or suggest “the plurality of audiovisual devices are enclosed in compartments of the armrests or the backrest,” as essentially claimed in claim 1. In May, the monitor (44) (i.e., an audiovisual device) is positioned outside the armrests (16, 17). The monitor is positioned on a monitor support (41) attached to the end of an arm (43). The armrest (16), instead, serves as the case of a personal computer by housing circuit boards, a connector panel, and a hard disk drive. (See lines 41-43, Column 3).

Furthermore, May does not render obvious claim 1 because May does not disclose or suggest “a plurality of wheels,” as essentially claimed in claim 1. Examiner states that “May disclose the claimed invention except for *only one wheel*. It would have been obvious...to provide more than one wheel, since...*mere duplication* of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.” However, May does **not** disclose a wheel. Moreover, May does not disclose or suggest any method of moving or changing positions of the chair using a wheel or a plurality of wheels.


Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinguished and not rendered obvious by May. The Examiner’s reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable due to their dependency on the allowable base claim.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the present application, including claims 1-16, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if he has any questions or comments in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank Chau
Reg. No. 34,136
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692 -8888
FAX: (516) 692- 8889